7504

SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Vol. IX, No. 3 | P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015 | February 15, 1979

US in Cautious Stance on R&D and Foreign Aid

If Emily Post were handing out awards for discretion, or if the American Tentative Society were recruiting new members, Ambassador Jean Wilkowski and her fellow planners at the State Department would qualify for attention.

The US national paper for the UN Conference on Science and Technology for Development (UNCSTD) —finally released by Ambassador Wilkowski in January after months of delay—indicates that the US has neither the right to dictate how the less developed world should grow, nor even the obligation to state what should be on the agenda at the Vienna meeting.

Dictations or statements of any sort for the August Conference, the US planners insist, might appear to be interference or, worse yet, exploitation of the struggling "third"-and "fourth"-world countries by the powerful "first"-world powers.

NSF Trying Methods To Cut Grant Red Tape---Page 3

Instead, the US paper simply "suggests" steps which "could" be taken to "improve" the application of science and technology to the problems of development.

The "US goals for the UN conference," the paper says, "are offered not to exclude any specific priorities, but to comprise overarching themes that can accommodate and do justice to them all."

What that means is not clear, but one thing is certain among Washington's many frustrated observers of US preparations for the conference: An office operating in the State Department with a budget sufficient to cover the salaries of a half-dozen high-ranking professionals for over two years ought, at the very least, to be able to say what "constitutes a science and technology activity"—never mind what the best science and technology activities are for development in this decade.

The problem of uncertainty, even their harshest critics contend, does not originate with Ambassador Wilkowski and her staff, and it certainly does not rest with Theodore Hesburgh, the President of Notre Dame University, who is Chairman of the US delegation to the conference.

The problem, the Washington critics say, is simply that the US has no clear-cut policy for science and technology—domestic or foreign.

On at least that one point, the US paper is firm. But to say so, particularly at length, many US scientists agree, helps neither them nor their counterparts in the less-developed world.

It is true that some 29 separate US government departments and agencies provide support for a host of science-related programs—which is a bit more than the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy could ever hope to coordinate thoroughly. It is also true that, over the years, the US has had differing and often conflicting foreign-aid policies, only some of which have been successful. Assuming the annals of history are right, it even is correct to say that our Founding Fathers "placed high value on the pursuit of knowledge and its application."

But, at least some observers argue, to spend nearly 30 of the 35 pages in a national document touting such past achievements as Benjamin Franklin's "scientific curiosity" and the contributions of the most prominent

(Continued on Page 2)

In Brief

Relations are getting back to normal in Soviet-American scientific and technical dealings at the upper levels. Following a freeze in protest against the Soviets' harsh treatment of several prominent dissident scientists, Presidential Science Adviser Frank Press led a delegation to Moscow last week to hold a meeting that the US abruptly cancelled last July. Relaxation of Soviet restrictions on Jewish emigration and a lessening of the anti-dissident campaign seem to have been favorably received by the US.

The Office of Technology Assessment is having to endure a new round of sniping from some of its Congressional overseers. Board Member Senators Ernest Hollings (D-SC) and Orrin G. Hatch (R-Utah) have been grousing about the size of the OTA payroll, the budget, honoraria for outside talks by staff, financing of dinner seminars, and so forth. Since nothing has been found to be amiss, there's wonder as to what they're up to.

Top science faculties in the US, according to a big survey reported in the January 15 *Chronicle of Higher Education:* Biological sciences and chemistry, Harvard; Mathematics and Statistics and Physics, UC Berkeley; Psychology, Stanford. MIT was first in engineering, and Harvard first in medicine.

. . . Foreign Aid Foundation is Big Offering

(Continued from Page 1)

of the US professional organizations adds little to the prospects for the success of an international conference.

In fact, critics inside the UN are quick to point out that avoiding such tactics was what the Secretary General of the Conference, Joao da Cosa, of Brazil, had in mind two years ago when he tried to impress upon the some 150 UN member nations that they were not to use the national papers simply to reiterate their good works.

Despite its tendencies toward self-congratulation, the US position paper can provide the diligent reader with at least some clues as to what role the US may play at the Vienna meeting.

For one thing, the US delegation apparently intends to maintain a low profile at the Conference in an effort to avoid being the central target in any confrontation between the "have" nations of the North and the "have-nots" of the South.

Several months ago, John Stromayer, deputy coordinator of US planning, admitted that the US office has spent much of the last two years preparing "big, fat books of position papers" which contain "proper replies" to whatever situations the US delegation might face.

Although US officials are still reluctant to say so openly, the national paper indicates that the planning officials continue to bank on the proposed US Foundation for International Technological Cooperation (FITC) to save the US from attack.

Announced by President Carter in Venezeula last March, the Foundation is expected to support increased research in science and technology and to encourage cooperation between US institutions and those of developing countries.

Although final plans for the Foundation have been delayed until Carter decides on how, and whether, to reorganize all of the government's foreign assistance programs, the Administration's 1980 budget request for the Foundation goes well beyond the $100-million mark. According to officials, some $80 million of the 1980 budget would come from AID, and another $25-million would be provided in new funds.

The US national paper is as vague about how the US actually can help the less-developed countries "transfer" or adapt scientific and technological advances as it is about how much autonomy to give the new Foundation.

While contending that US interests should not exclude the specific priorities of other countries, the US paper suggests three "general goals" it hopes the Conference will set out to accomplish over the coming months and years.

The first is that by the year 2000, "the worst aspects of poverty" should be overcome.

"The Conference," the US paper says, "should search for ways through which science and technology can best help to accomplish this."

The second "major goal" of the Conference, the paper argues, is to advance "the economic growth" of the developing world.

Without saying how that might be accomplished, the planners call for "a more equitable sharing of the fruits of economic progress among all nations."

And, finally, the US paper insists on "global measures" to deal "more effectively" with the mounting pressures of the world's growing population and its shrinking supplies of food, water, and energy.

The US-proposed strategies for carrying out its goals include greater emphasis on education to provide the trained manpower the less-developed world needs. The US would also increase support for basic research, in quest of breakthroughs on such needed developments as pest-resistant strains of grain and new sources of energy.

In order to avoid a world divided by "producers and creators, on the one hand, and purchasers and consumers of technology on the other hand," the US paper insists, the developing nations must decide for themselves specifically what kind of support is needed and how it should be given.

In "order to have an effective transfer," the US

(Continued on Page 3)

©Science & Government Report, Inc., 1979

ISSN 0048-9581

Editor and Publisher
Daniel S. Greenberg

Contributing Editor
Anne Roark

European Correspondents
Michael Kenward (London)
Francois Seguier (Paris)

Circulation Manager
Alice Anne Freund

Independently published by *Science & Government Report,* Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, July and August. Annual Subscription: Institutions, $84.50 (two years, $149.50); individuals, $44 (two years, $75). Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St., N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second class postage paid at Washington, DC. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on Xerox University Microfilms.

Science Foundation Seeks Paperwork Cuts

Ever-hopeful in the face of reasons not to be, the National Science Foundation has set up several trial programs designed to reduce the paperwork that goes on between it and its academic clients.

"If successful," says NSF Director Richard C. Atkinson in a press release, "this experiment will show that the nation's universities, working in partnership with the Federal government, can give the American taxpayer more research value for each dollar spent and with a good deal less frustration over red tape."

Be that as it may, NSF isn't about to revolutionize the grant business, but is simply trying out—under new labels—several administrative techniques that have off and on been employed by itself and other granting agencies.

Under what NSF calls a master grant concept, grants approved by NSF in a single year at an institution can be pooled by the institution for several purposes. Thus, several investigators with money for equipment could combine resources to get an even better piece of hardware. But the system does not allow for any changes in level of effort, scope of research, or principal investigators.

Another part of the trial goes under the title of Organizational Prior Approval System, which means that local committees will be authorized to make some decisions that are now handled by NSF's own staff. This will include changes in originally approved plans for equipment, staff, deadlines, and so forth. Careful recordkeeping will be required, and NSF will ultimately want to examine the records. But the system is expected to cut out a lot of delays that now occur when grantees at an institution want to change their plans.

Finally, in what may be an approving nod to the gambling spirit that is sweeping the country, NSF's trial program will allow pre-award costs to be incurred by its grantees. What this means is that if it looks as though a grant is going to be made—but formal notice is not yet in hand—the expectant grantee may run up some bills that can be charged to the grant, assuming it comes through. However, if the grant falls through, a not-unknown event in the history of modern science, NSF will not foot the bill.

The pre-award spending authority is obviously useful for lining up research staff and buying equipment prior to the official starting gun. Since NSF is confining the system to the expenditures that occur no more than 30 days prior to the award of a grant, the hazards do not appear to be excessive, though, obviously, they do exist.

The methods that the Foundation is experimenting with are designed to reduce a lot of the rigidities that now contort the system. For example, if one NSF grant account at an institution is flush with money while another has gone dry just prior to renewal coming through, it can be perilous to borrow; however, under the system that NSF is trying, funds would be combined, and so long as it all comes out even in the end, tactical shifts are permissible.

The Foundation stresses that the system is aimed at dealing with post-award matters, and that it has nothing to do with the sacrosanct peer-review system. In regard to Congress, which is the place of origin of much of NSF's red tape, the Foundation touched base with its various legislative mentors and tormentors

(Continued on Page 4)

UN Conference

(Continued from Page 2)

planners say, "the information base in the developing countries must be broadened to permit them to select what they need from the international supermarket of technology, to reject what they do not need, to choose among competitive offerings. . ."

To marshall this information base and to coordinate global efforts, the US paper calls for greater and more effective participation by the United Nations.

President Carter has already made a proposal on the "Reform and Restructuring of the UN System," which, the US paper says, would allow the UN to become "more responsive to the needs of individual countries and the requirements of addressing compelling global problems."

While greater managerial coordination in the UN is called for, the US paper argues, what is not needed is yet another UN agency to take on the task.

Despite such lapses into dogmatism about what kind of international organization should be set up, the US paper ends on the same conciliatory note with which it begins.

"Between now and August 1979, when the conference convenes for its final and decisive session in Vienna, Austria, events will alter many of the currently significant issues. They will not, however, in any way lessen the US resolve to be a constructive partner in this unique effort to make science and technology work better for man."

Just how long this resolve will actually last will be determined at least in part by the specific terms of the partnership demanded by the third-and fourth-world countries whose numbers (well over 100), if not their wealth and know-how, defy indifference.—Anne Roark (The author is an assistant editor of *The Chronicle of Higher Education.*)

Carter Science Aide Outlines Space Policy

The once-ebullient space program has been in the fiscal and programmatic doldrums for several years now, and, in response, Congress has been prodding the Administration to put more money and technological adventurism into the government's space activities. The Administration has replied with expressions of pride at the considerable array of ongoing and planned US space activities, plus insistence on maintaining a cautious step-by-step strategy. The most definitive statement on the Administration's space thinking was given January 25 by White House Science Adviser Frank Press in testimony for the Senate Subcommittee on on Science, Technology, and Space. Following are key excerpts:

Over the last two decades, the United States has spent about $100 billion on Federal space activities. Some $67 billion have been spent for civil programs, of which over $25 billion was for the Apollo program alone. We have spent $33 billion on military programs, and we now spend as much annually for military programs as we do for civil activities. This reflects the operational character that space activities have taken and broadens the perspective from which national space policy must evolve. . .Thus, when we view the American space activities, we must realize that we are dealing with both national security and civilian programs, on which a total of $7.1 billion will be spent in FY 1979. The FY 1980 budget request for these programs is $7.9 billion, an increase of 12 percent. It is important to point out that these estimates do not include the increasingly important US private sector investment in space—over $2 billion in communications satellites alone. . .

The Carter Administration's space policy is designed to carry us successfully into the next era in space. In this context we have for the first time the opportunity for choices with regard to direction and pace. The policy is centered in three basic tenets:

First: Our space policy will reflect a balanced strategy of applications, science, and technology development containing essential key elements that will emphasize space applications that will bring important benefits to our understanding of earth resources, climate, weather, pollution, and agriculture. . . Emphasize space exploration in a manner that retains the challenge and exceitement and permits the nation to retain the vitality of its space technology base. . . Assure US scientific and technological leadership in space for the security and welfare of the nation and to continue space R&D necessary to provide the basis for later programmatic decisions. . .

Second: Space activities will be pursued because they can be uniquely or more efficiently accomplished in space. Necessarily, our space policy will become more evolutionary rather than centering around a single engineering feat but more on the pluralistic objectives of our society—e.g., scientific inquiry, activities with economic benefits, national security, etc. More and more, space is becoming a place to work in—a place which is an extention of our environment.

Third: At this time it is infeasible and premature to commit to a high-challenge, highly-visible space engineering initiative. As the resources and manpower requirements for Shuttle development phase down, we will have the flexibility to give greater attention to new space activities, to continue programs at present levels, or to contract them. . .

During the civil-space-policy assessment, considerable attention was given to long-term economic development activity in space. The President decided that it was premature at this time to make a full commitment to the development of a satellite solar power

(Continued on Page 5)

Space Law Documents

Space Law: Selected Basic Documents, Second Edition, a collection of the principal agreements governing international space activities of the US, may be obtained without charge by sending a request and a self-addressed mailing label to: Subcommittee on Science, Technology, and Space, Room 5202 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510.

NSF

(Continued from Page 3)

before going ahead. An NSF official said that they all approved.

The NSF system steers away from giving granting authority to local committees, which is what got the National Institutes of Health into Congressional trouble some years ago when it tried to reduce its workload by giving block grants to its major institutional clients so that they could sort out the distribution. That authority remains with NSF and its regular advisory apparatus.

Trials of the new systems, in various forms, began early this year in the chemistry departments of the University of Florida, UCLA, UC San Diego, and the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. MIT, Wisconsin, and Columbia are scheduled to join the experiment.

(Continued from Page 4)

station or space manufacturing facility. With respect to solar power satellites, we must first answer serious questions about technological uncertainties, possible environmental effects, vulnerability, and economic cost-benefits. We will pursue an evolutionary program that is directed toward assessing future options. This program will stress science and basic technology— integrated with a complementary ground R&D program—and will continue to evaluate the relative costs and benefits of proposed space activities compared to earth-based activities. . .

In your invitation to testify, Mr. Chairman, you asked that I comment on proposed Senate legislation on space policy. . .

Regarding the first point, it is the Administration's policy not to commit now to the future programmatic activities without first undertaking necessary evolutionary research and development steps. We believe that it is not appropriate for a policy statement which provides the framework for space efforts to outline specific missions and projects for very long time periods. It is more appropriate, I believe, that priorities be set depending on the promise of the science and technology available and the budget situation at a given time rather than over-specifying now what the future needs will be.

On the second point—incremental reports to Congress called for in bills—we believe that they are not necessary. As you know, NASA periodically sets forth its future goals over the next decades, on which both the Executive and Legislative Branches draw. Also, the Space Act of 1958 requires an annual report. The hearings, as we are having today, would seem to me to be a more productive means of communication beyond the reports already required by law. . .

The USSR remains the primary US space competitor in national security systems and in space exploration. The Soviets place considerable emphasis on the use of space for prestige and launched over 100 satellites last year, mostly with military applications. Technologically, US satellites are more sophisticated and reliable—e.g., longer lifetime in orbit—than Soviet systems. Consequently, the US needs to launch many fewer satellites per year (33 in 1978) than do the Soviets.

The Soviets are continuing a highly-visible manned space program. Last year they launched four manned flights, twice broke manned endurance records, and brought to fruition a cooperative program—flying East European cosmonauts. While the Soviets may strive to surpass—or to try to be seen as surpassing—the US in space achievements, we will do what is necessary to assure our overall leadership in space will be maintained in the decades ahead. The Shuttle program will dramatically illustrate the advantage that the US maintains in space technology—in load carrying capacity, low cost operations, ability to retrieve, repair, and eventually to construct in space.

In sum, as we enter into the 1980's, our approach on national programs will be transformed by the advent of the Shuttle, moving the US out of the era of "one-shot spectaculars" and into the era of routine work in space. This transformation is historic. If we accept this fundamental transformation in the use of space, we must also accept the premise that space no longer is the arena of a few. Rather, as space becomes an extension of man's working environment, we can expect more and more nations to want to share in the benefits of space activities.

Science Board Appointments

The following have been nominated by the President for regular six-year terms on the 24-member National Science Board, which assembles monthly or so and goes through the motions of serving as the "policymaking body" of the National Science Foundation:

Eugene H. Cota-Robles, Vice Chancellor and Professor of Biology, University of California at Santa Cruz.

Ernestine Friedl, Professor of Anthropology, Department of Anthropology, Duke University.

Walter E. Massey, Dean of the College and Professor of Physics, Brown University.

David V. Ragone, Dean of the College of Engineering, University of Michigan.

Edwin E. Salpeter, J. G. White Professor of Physical Sciences, Cornell University, and

Charles P. Slichter, Professor of Physics and in the Center for Advanced Study, University of Illinois at Urbana—renominated after completion of partial term.

NBS-Soviet Science Pact

The National Bureau of Standards has entered into an agreement with the Soviet Academy of Sciences that provides for scientific exchanges and cooperation in various fields, including thermal physics, materials science, spectroscopy, and cryogenics. The arrangements comes under the 1972 US-USSR science and technology agreement, and is the first of its kind between NBS and a Soviet institution.

Britain: Hard Push for Electronic Payoff

London. Last year was "when Britain woke up to microelectronics," as Prime Minister James Callaghan put it recently. And one of the more surprising aspects of this sudden interest is Callaghan's personal involvement, since his previous record on technological affairs generally reflected the British politicians' usual neglect of technological subjects.

It was the Prime Minister who personally announced the three-year, $180-million aid package for the microelectronics industry—a task that would normally be handled by the Secretary of State for Industry in an address to the House of Commons. Instead, Callaghan, who would normally be constrained from talking on such a topic in the House, chose to unveil the program at a meeting of the National Economic Development Council (NEDC), a forum for industry, labor, and the government.

Callaghan revealed that the $27-million microelectronics applications program—set up to help companies find out how microelectronics can improve their products—is to be expanded to $100 million. There will also be money for an "awareness campaign" aimed at "reaching 50,000 key decision-takers in three years through discussions and conferences throughout the country."

There will also be an education and training program in which the government plans to provide 3000 more training places for programmers and systems analysts this year. The government will also establish schemes for giving people in existing jobs the microelectronics skills they will need to adapt to the new technology.

The fourth part of the new initiative will be through buying by central and local government, "to encourage the full use of the new technology."

One of several papers on microelectronics put before the same meeting of the NEDC came from the Central Policy Review Staff (CPRS)—the Cabinet's own "think tank." The paper—on the employment and social consequences of microelectronics—rejected the more extreme fears about the amount of unemployment that microelectronics would bring to British industry (SGR Vol. VIII, No. 12).

The paper dismissed the suggestion that over the next 15 years microelectronics will produce between 3 and 5 million more unemployed workers in Britain because, it concluded, these forecasts overestimate the speed at which microelectronics are likely to be applied in the UK, and underestimate the job-creating role this new technology will play. The report also points out that the predicted increase in unemployment is very similar to the number of jobs lost in the contracting sectors of British industry over the past 15 years.

The picture may not be as gloomy as the pessimists claim, but the CPRS warns that "the real employment gains will accrue to those countries which can translate microelectronic innovations into new, attractive, inexpensive products for mass consumption. This is where the UK has been, in the past, relatively weak and UK manufacturers slow to modify their products and their production processes." Thus the way is open for yet another round of the old British disease—we invent something, fail to capitalize on the idea, and then see other countries making a fortune by selling the technology to us as well as others.

While no one claims that Britain is ahead of other countries when it comes to microelectronics technology, there is a feeling that for once academic research is up with, if not ahead of, industrial needs since the Science Research Council has assembled a formidable program of research and development on the design and manufacture of microelectronic components. There is, therefore, a belief that Britain could throw off its past sluggishness in innovation and, with the oil wealth from the North Sea, come through this technological revolution a little ahead of its current position in the world's technology league.

However, the CPRS warns that "unless the UK does

(Continued on Page 7)

Ex-Rep. Mosher in AAAS Post

Charles Mosher, the eight-term Ohio Republican who retired from the House in 1977 and then returned as chief of staff of his old committee, Science and Technology, has a new job: He's filling in a manager of public programs of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, replacing Richard Scribner, who is on leave at the State Department until at least September.

According to a AAAS announcement, Mosher is "responsible for planning, initiating, and managing various programs intended to produce more effective communication and mutual understanding between the science/engineering community and other elements of American society, particularly the political community and government agencies, including state and local governments, universities, and industry."

Mosher, who developed a cronyish relationship with the elders of the scientific community during his Congressional service, teaches a graduate seminar at the George Washington University. He is also a member of the National Commission on Research—which is a university inspired study of science-government finance and regulations (SGR Vol. VIII, No. 17)—and the Commission on the Humanities.

News Notes: Guy Stever, Coal, Law, Etc.

H. Guyford Stever, who formerly headed the National Science Foundation and served as science adviser to President Ford, has been appointed to a three-year term as chairman of the Assembly of Engineering of the National Research Council (NRC) of the National Academy of Sciences (NAS).

Stever takes over from Courtland Perkins, who stays on as President of the National Academy of Engineering, the separate and unequal partner of the NAS. The assembly is one of eight units of the NRC, which is the operating arm of the two academies.

An NRC announcement states that Stever's arrival will enable Perkins to "devote fulltime" to his other duties, but did not state whether this includes Perkins' long-simmering scheme to get the Academy of Engineering out from under the Academy of Sciences (SGR Vol. VIII, No. 7).

●

The Department of Energy is inviting comments on the ground rules it will employ for distributing some of the innumerable riches contained in its vast budget—13 coal research laboratories.

Proposed procedures were published in the January 22 *Federal Register,* and comments will be received at a hearing February 23 in Washington, or in writing until March 19.

Under the regulations proposed by DOE, 10 of the 13 laboratories must be located in states with abundant coal reserves, and at least one must be located within each of the nation's major coal regions, including Alaska. For further information: University Coal Research Program, Room 501, DOE, 400 First St., N.W., Washington, DC 20545.

Law and Science, a 143-page bibliography "on the interface of science and technology and the legal system," is available for $7.50 per copy from: Science, Technology and Human Value, Aiken Computation Lab 234, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 02138. The bibliography was compiled by Morris L. Cohen, Jan Stepan, and Naomi Ronen, of the Harvard Law School Library. Assistance was provided by the National Endowment for the Humanities.

●

Rep. Morris Udall (D-Ariz) has been elected chairman of the Congressional Board of the Office of Technology Assessment, succeeding Sen. Edward Kennedy (D-Mass) as the chairmanship rotated to the House for the next two years. Sen. Ted Stevens (R-Ala.) was elected vice chairman.

Meanwhile, after two candidates accepted and then changed their minds (SGR Vol. IX, No. 2), OTA has finally filled the post of Assistant Director for Science, Information, and Transportation. The appointee is Eric H. Willis, a nuclear physicist who has been deputy assistant secretary for energy technology in the Department of Energy.

●

Kenneth Prewitt, professor of political science at the University of Chicago, has been appointed president of the Social Science Research Council, succeeding Eleanor B. Sheldon.

Britain

(Continued from Page 6)

all it can to accelerate its own microelectronics revolution, it will be subjected to even fiercer international competition in the home market, and will also fail to win large new overseas markets for related products. Although developments in many areas are not yet as dramatic as some commentators have been claiming, it is of the utmost importance that the UK be ahead of its competitors in benefiting from the productivity increases which the applications of microelectronics will make possible. Internationally it will be a case of the devil take the hindmost."

Subscription Form

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

☐Renew my subscription; ☐Check enclosed

☐Enter my subscription; ☐Please bill

Institutional subscribers: one year, $84.50☐; two years, $149.50☐

Individual subscribers: one year, $44☐; two years, $75☐

(Overseas airmail, $17.50 per year additional.)

Name _____

Address _____

_____ Zip _____

R&D and Congressional Committee Shifts

With the House having sorted out its various chairmanships for the first session of the 96th Congress, following are some results of particular interest to the scientific community:

Since the indicted Dan Flood (D-Pa.) stepped down from the chairmanship of the Labor-HEW Appropriations Subcommittee, the fiscal fortunes of the National Institutes of Health will be under the chairmanship of William H. Natcher (D-Ky.) Natcher is not known to be knowledgeable about health-related matters, having concentrated his legislative energies on spitfulness toward the District of Columbia in his capacity as chairman of the DC Committee. With the Administration budgeting NIH for no increase for the coming fiscal year, the Labor-HEW chairmanship will be crucial if, as expected, an attempt is made to force the White House to raise biomedical research spending.

Meanwhile chairmanship of the Health and the Environment Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has gone to Henry Waxman (D-Calif.) following an up and down contest with Richardson Preyer (D-NC). Waxman, a liberal third-termer, devoted some $24,000 of his own excess campaign money to the elections of members of the subcommittee, and came out surprise winner over far more senior Preyer. What Preyer had going against him was a big block of inherited stock that he holds in the Richardson-Merrell Pharmaceutical Co. With drug regulation reform high on the subcommittee's agenda, Preyer said that, to avoid conflict of interest he would abstain from any deliberations or votes concerning the pharmaceutical industry. Critics said that this wouldn't wash out the conflict but it would make him an absentee chairman. Waxman pressed hard, and over the opposition of the House leadership, which does not like to see the seniority system too badly abused, he won the chairmanship, 15-12. Now recognized as a tough and extremely ambitious politician, Waxman is expected to pressure NIH to expand its preventive health programs, particularly through the National Cancer Institute, which he has severely criticized in the past.

Among other House changes are a new chairman for the Science and Technology Committee, Rep. Don Fuqua (D-Fla.), which was expected. Within that Committee, Rep. George E. Brown Jr. (D-Calif.), who once worked as an industrial physicist (BA from UCLA), will chair the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Technology, which writes the laws for the National Science Foundation. Brown is known to be keenly interested in his new chairmanship and can be expected to become closely involved with NSF affairs. He may turn out to be a bit of a pest from the perspective of the Foundation's bureaucracy, but he is fundamentally friendly toward science, and if he does any badgering, it will be in a paternalistic, rather than a Proxmirian fashion.

Also on Science and Technology, a reshuffling of subcommittee jurisdictions has given the hotly debated Clinch River breeder reactor to Rep. Mike McCormack (D-Wash), as chairman of the Energy, Research and Production Subcommittee.

The Senate has undergone relatively few changes in chairmanships that affect science and technology. What remains to be seen is how much time Senator Edward Kennedy will be able to devote to his chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Health and Scientific Research. As has been frequently and correctly noted, the Senator has an excellent staff—which, in Congressional matters, is the biggest part of the game. But he also is heavily committed with a number of other major committee assignments, plus the sport of keeping 'em guessing about his presidential intentions.

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C.

-00006 99/99
XEROX UNIV MICROFILMS
300 N ZEEB RD
ANN ARBOR MI 48106